

Memorandum

To: Chair and Commissioners

Date: August 8, 2001

From: Robert I. Remen

File: Book Item 3.5
Information

**Ref.: PROGRESS REPORT FROM ALPINE, AMADOR AND CALAVERAS
COUNTIES REGARDING THE TRI-COUNTY MEMORADUM OF
UNDERSTANDING FOR POOLED STATE TRANSPORTATION
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FUNDS**

This is an information item from Alpine, Amador and Calaveras counties to discuss the delivery of the four State highway projects funded with pooled STIP funds. The report will include a discussion, which will include the three Counties' concerns regarding project delivery and the impacts it may have on their desire to obtain ITIP funding, as well as the continuation of the Tri-County Partnership.

The four State highway projects to be discussed are:

SR 49 Bypass, Sutter Creek and Amador City
SR4 Bypass, Angels Camp
SR 4 Passing Lane
SR 88 Passing Lanes, Hams & Cooks Stations

**ALPINE COUNTY LOCAL
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

50 Diamond Valley Road
Markleeville, CA 96120
(530) 694-2140

**AMADOR COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

11400 American Legion Drive, Suite A
Jackson, CA 95642
(209) 267-2282

**CALAVERAS COUNCIL
OF GOVERNMENTS**

692 Marshall Avenue, Unit A
San Andreas, CA 95249
(209) 754-2094

August 8, 2001

Robert Remen, Executive Director
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street, P.O. Box 942873 (MS-52)
Sacramento, CA 94273-0001

Subject: Tri-County MOU for Pooled STIP Funds

Dear Mr. Remen:

On January 18, 2001, the counties of Alpine, Amador, and Calaveras provided to the CTC a presentation about the history of their Tri-County Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for using "pooled" STIP funds for purposes of constructing four mutually prioritized state highway projects. The four state highway projects are as follows:

1. AMA 49 Bypass of Sutter Creek and Amador City
2. CAL 4 Bypass of Angels Camp
3. CAL 4 passing lane
4. AMA 88 passing lanes

The Tri-Counties explained that a major reason why this cooperative effort was put forth by the Boards of Supervisors and Transportation Commissions of three rural counties was to secure a 25% match of state discretionary ITIP funding. Enclosed please find a chart labeled "Alpine, Amador, and Calaveras STIP Projects Cost Estimate Through 2002 STIP" which shows the current cost estimates for each project together with the regional share (RIP) and state share (ITIP) funds that are anticipated for the program.

During our presentation to the CTC, the Tri-Counties showed the latest project delivery schedules for all four projects as provided by Caltrans. A page showing the project delivery schedules that were presented at that time is also enclosed. In January, the Tri-Counties and Caltrans reported that environmental documents for all four of the state highway projects should be finished by October 2001 prior to the 2002 STIP process and that this would enable full RIP and IIP funding of the Tri-County MOU in the 2002 STIP. Full funding of the Tri-County MOU within the 2002 STIP is important to the three counties because we are in the process of drafting a second MOU for another package of projects to be initiated with the 2002 STIP.

Robert Remen
August 8, 2001
Page two

During their meeting in January the CTC appointed Commissioner Kirk Lindsey to serve as a liaison for the Tri-County effort and instructed the Tri-Counties to keep him informed regarding progress in meeting our goals. As of June 11, 2001, the Tri-Counties learned that Caltrans will likely be unable to complete three of the four required environmental documents before October 2001. The Tri-Counties learned that subsequent phases of the AMA 49 Bypass project will likely be delayed. This raised concerns that construction of our other projects (the CAL 4 Bypass and the AMA 88 passing lanes) may also become delayed. On July 24, 2001, representatives of the Tri-Counties met with Commissioner Lindsey to advise him of these concerns.

Mr. Lindsey expressed the CTC's support for the Tri-County effort and suggested the matter be brought back before the full Commission during their meeting in August. It was suggested that a discussion of this matter could provide both a forum to resolve issues affecting the Tri-County partnership and another "test case" in the effort to resolve the statewide project delivery dilemma.

In addition to the two charts outlining costs and schedules for the four state highway projects, we are also providing two pages that show additional information about the Tri-Counties' past and current experiences monitoring Caltrans' delivery of our projects. The Tri-Counties appreciate the CTC's continued direct involvement toward successful execution of the Tri-County MOU. The Tri-Counties are hopeful that our discussions at the CTC meeting in August will clarify and strengthen our relationship with Caltrans and produce a clear set of expectations for the Tri-County component of the 2002 STIP.

Sincerely,

Charles F. Field
Executive Director
Amador County Transportation Commission

George Dondero
Executive Director
Calaveras Council of Governments

Leonard Turnbeaugh
Executive Secretary
Alpine County Transportation Commission

Alpine, Amador, and Calaveras STIP Projects
Cost Estimate Through 2002 STIP
(In \$Millions)

Version 14

8/2/01

PROJECT	STIP CYCLES									
	ACTUAL PRIOR					CURRENT		ESTIMATED FUTURE		
	(Note 1) Grand-fathered	1998			SUP 1998		2000 Amendment		(Note 3) 2002	
		RIP	IIP	ADV	RIP	Unallocated RES	RIP	Unallocated RES	(Note 2) RIP	(Note 4) IIP (Note 2) Unallocated RES
Amador 49 Bypass	\$ 16.507	\$ 4.982				-		9.072		
Angels Camp Bypass		\$ 8.360	\$ 3.183	\$ 2.791		\$ 3.708	\$ (3.039)	\$ -	\$ 1.899	\$ 14.536
Alpine's Cal 4 Passing Lanes		\$ 2.783								
Alpine's SR 88 Passing Lane					\$ 0.413		\$ 0.495	\$ 0.194	\$ 4.991	
Future STIP Projects										\$ 8.080
Subtotal	\$ 16.507	\$ 16.125	\$ 3.183	\$ 2.791	\$ 0.413	\$ 3.708	\$ (2.544)	\$ 9.266	\$ 6.890	\$ 14.536
Total	\$ 16.507	\$22.099			\$4.121		\$6.722		\$29.506	

FUNDING BREAKDOWN										
Total Grandfathered and Rip Funding Amount Percentage of Total Funding	\$ 16.507	\$ 16.125		\$ 2.791	\$ 0.413	\$ 3.708	\$ (2.544)	\$ 9.266	\$ 6.890	\$ 53.156 75%
Total IIP Funding Amount Percentage of Total Funding			\$ 3.183						\$ 14.536	\$ 17.719 25%
Future STIP Projects									\$ 8.080	\$ 8.080

NOTES

- 1 The allocated grandfathered amount of \$16.51m for Amador 49 Bypass does not include \$3.621m for support costs originally funded (grandfathered) for project.
- 2 2002 STIP Allocation Total for the three counties is: \$ 14.970
- 3 The unallocated reserve in 2002 will include \$8.080 million to program project development work on the next generation of state highway project priorities in the 3 counties.
- 4 The IIP share is based on a 75/25 split of the total cost for all four projects.

ALPINE, AMADOR AND CALAVERAS STIP PROJECTS
PROJECT DELIVERY SCHEDULE
 Caltrans Schedule as of January 2001

Date: January 2001

PROJECT	FISCAL YEAR														
	1998 and 2000 STIP Funding Period										3 Added Years 2002 STIP Cycle				
	Dec	Jun	Dec	Jun	Dec	Jun	Dec	Jun	Dec	Jun	Dec	Jun	Dec	Jun	Dec
	99/00		00/01		01/02		02/03		03/04		04/05		05/06		06/07
Amador 49 Bypass															
PA&ED															
PS&E															
RW															
CONSTRUCTION															
Angels Camp Bypass															
PA&ED															
PS&E															
RW															
CONSTRUCTION															
Cal Passing Lane, Cottage Springs															
PA&ED															
PS&E															
RW															
CONSTRUCTION															
SR 88 Passing Lanes, Pine Grove															
PA&ED															
PS&E															
RW															
CONSTRUCTION															

Cal 4 Bypass Angels Camp			
	Original Schedule	Adjusted Schedule (Caltrans 1/01)	Current Expectations (see notes)
Environmental (PA&ED)	August 2001	August 2001	January 2002 (1)
Design (PS&E)	December 2004	December 2004	February 2005
R/W Cert.	December 2004	December 2004	March 2005? (2)
Construction (RTL)	December 2004	December 2004	March 2005
Completed	June 2007	June 2007	June 2007? (3)
Notes: (1) FWS review of biological assessment has been expected since February 15, 2001. Caltrans received FWS formal comments on June 6, 2001. Caltrans intends to provide formal response by August 3, 2001. Caltrans is “hopeful” they will have FWS concurrence by September 6, 2001. Caltrans has adjusted completion of PA&ED from August 2001 to January 2002. (2) Caltrans currently requires 3 years to complete the R/W phase of the project. Will delays to environmental cause delays to this phase (similar to SR 49 Bypass experience)? (3) Will delays to environmental and R/W cause delays to construction (similar to SR 49 Bypass experience)?			

AMA 88 Passing Lanes, Hams and Cooks Stations			
	Original Schedule	Adjusted Schedule (Caltrans 1/01)	Current Expectations (see notes)
Environmental (PA&ED)	October 2001	October 2001	June 2002? (1)
Design (PS&E)	June 2003	June 2003	April 2003?
R/W Cert.	June 2003	June 2003	June 2003?
Construction (RTL)	June 2003	June 2003	July 2003?
Completed	September 2004	September 2004	November 2004?
Notes: (1) In March 2001, Caltrans Headquarters determined that the lower (Cook's Station) passing lane project cannot be constructed as planned because it feeds traffic into a 25 MPH curve which is not safe. It was agreed to shift the passing lane approximately 0.2 miles uphill (east). This alternative would have minimal impact on current cost estimates, however, it will require additional environmental review. Caltrans advised that this change will delay completion of PA&ED by up to one year (August 2001 to June 2002), however, it will not impact the schedule for completion of the project's other phases (PS&E, R/W, and construction). In June 2001, Caltrans advised that a major reason why the environmental document will require 10 more months is because Caltrans has chosen to address concerns of the Forest Service regarding a former consultant's failure to address U.S. Forest Service comments on a National Register historic places evaluation for Highway 88, the “Old Alpine Highway.” We consider this to be a major concern because the USFS and SHPO can, like FWS, cause the June 2002 deadline to be missed.			

Tri-County MOU Project Delivery Concerns

July 24, 2001

Amador 49 Bypass, Sutter Creek and Amador City			
	Original Schedule (9/97 PSR)	Adjusted Schedule (Caltrans 1/01)	Current Expectations (see notes)
Environmental (PA&ED)	August 1999	October 2001	December 2001 (1)
Design (PS&E)	August 2001	November 2002	August 2002
R/W Cert.	September 2001	December 2002	December 2002?(2)
Construction (RTL)	September 2001	December 2002	December 2002
Completed	August 2003	June 2005	April 2006 ?(3)
<p><u>Past</u></p> <p>a. <i>In May 1998 Caltrans Project Manager advises there will be a 16 month delay for the project based on new information about Caltrans' resources and the decision to prepare an EIS instead of an EA. (PA&ED shifts from August 1999 to December 2000. The schedule was adjusted in the 1998 STIP Amendment.)</i></p> <p>b. <i>On February 9, 1999, ACTC Director writes to Caltrans Regional Division Chief for Environmental Planning about concerns for completion of draft environmental document on schedule (by June 1999). On February 25, 1999, Caltrans Division Chief for Environmental Planning responds that the milestone for draft EIS completion is not as critical as the PA&ED milestone (December 2000). "Float time" can be assigned to the DEIS milestone without jeopardizing the PA&ED date.</i></p> <p>c. <i>On March 23, 1999 an interdisciplinary team meeting was held with Caltrans specialists and experienced ACTC consultants to help organize a process for delivery of the AMA 49 Bypass environmental document on schedule including federal agency consensus. After this meeting, ACTC efforts to integrate and assist Caltrans environmental were largely unsuccessful. By October 27, 1999, ACTC was advised that Caltrans and the FHWA would not allow the ACTC or other "outside" firms or agencies to review work on the environmental document until it completed internal review by Caltrans and the FHWA (this was not accomplished until January 2001).</i></p> <p>d. <i>On November 8, 2000, it becomes clear the PA&ED date will be missed. The Tri-Counties meet with District 10 Director and staff to review project delivery milestones and efforts that can be taken to improve delivery.</i></p> <p>e. <i>On January 18, 2001, ACTC gives presentation to CTC showing new PA&ED milestone is October 2001 and all other project delivery milestones (design, right of way, and construction) will remain on schedule.</i></p> <p><u>Present</u></p> <p>(1) On June 11, 2001, Caltrans advised that the Natural Environmental Study (NES) is now at FWS and cautions that FWS may not agree with findings concerning the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (VELB). Early concurrence by all federal agencies including FWS was identified as a "critical path" issue by Caltrans, FHWA, and ACTC staff in March 1999. Concurrence regarding the VELB was not achieved with the FWS as planned therefore Caltrans has adjusted the schedule for completion of PA&ED to December 2001.</p> <p>(2) Caltrans advised on June 11, 2001 that, due to delays with environmental, there will not be enough time to complete right-of-way certification and ready-to-list by the current schedule, December 2002.</p> <p>(3) Caltrans advised that the State's CTIPS shows project completion date as April 2006. The previous date for completion of the project's final report has always been December 2004 until Caltrans changed it to be June 2005 in January 2001. A major factor is that Caltrans' Design Engineer is not yet able to determine if the project will take 2 or 3 seasons to complete.</p>			